



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/886,457	06/20/2001	Greg Udelhoven	1340.002US1	4980
21186 7590 01/15/2009 SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A. P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402				
EXAMINER				
SALIARD, SHANNON S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3628				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/15/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/886,457

Applicant(s)

UDELHOVEN ET AL.

Examiner

SHANNON S. SALIARD

Art Unit

3628

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. Applicant has amended claims 1, 14, and 25. No claims have been cancelled or newly added. Thus, claims 1-37 remain pending and are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 05 November 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3. Applicant argues, "Flake does not disclose receiving data for a plurality of travelers." First, Examiner notes that Flake et al discloses, "Travel service request information from a customer is preferably input as data to system 10, by an agent." [col 3, lines 50-52]. Thus, Flake et al discloses receiving data for a traveler. While Flake et al discloses receiving data for a traveler, Flake et al does not disclose receiving data for a plurality of travelers. However, mere duplication of parts has no patentable significance unless new and unexpected result is produced, see *In re Harza*, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960).

4. Applicant further argues, "Gardener does not disclose maintaining in a database associations with subsets of travelers with particular travel arranger." However, the Examiner disagrees. Gardener discloses, " System core services 22 is configured to operate with a series of databases, including flight schedule availability database 12, published negotiated fares/rules database 14, customer corporate profiles database 16, master reservations database 18, and revenue summary/detail database 20. " [0038].

"End session 138 records summary statistics at the end of a user session. Get new traveler 140 allows an user designated as a travel planner to retrieve the profile information for a second or subsequent traveler"[0085]. Thus, the profile information is stored in a database and the profile information is retrieved from the database. Furthermore, the travel planner is designated to retrieve profile information of a traveler. Thus, the traveler is associated in some way to the traveler for the system to know that the travel planner is allowed to access traveler information for that particular traveler.

5. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, not only does the combination yield a predictable result, but it would be obvious to combine the teachings of Flake et al with Gardener et al for the purpose of allowing the travel planner to act on behalf of the traveler.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 1-3, 5-10, 13-15, 18-23, 24-27, 29-34, and 37** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flake et al [U.S. Patent No. 5,832,451] in view of Gardener et al [US 2002/0178034].

As per **claims 1, 14, and 25**, Flake et al discloses a method for providing travel services, the method comprising:

receiving data from a client system to insert into a traveler database having traveler information for a plurality of travelers (col 3, lines 46-52; col 8, lines 33-36; see Fig. 1);

receiving a request from a travel arranger for at least one travel service (col 7, lines 1-14); .

requesting information regarding the at least one travel service from a Global Distribution System (GDS) (col 18, line 67-col 19, line 1);

retrieving traveler data from the traveler database, wherein the traveler data includes at least a portion of the traveler information; and displaying the traveler data in conjunction with the information from the GDS (col 2, lines 19-24; col 7, lines 16-27, col 19, lines 2-15, displays for the agent {arranger} the requesting customer's business/ and or individual profile information, along with all CRS information).

While Flake et al discloses receiving data from a client system to insert into a traveler database having traveler information for a plurality of travelers (col 3, lines 46-

52; col 8, lines 33-36; see Fig. 1), Flake et al does not explicitly disclose receiving data for a plurality of travelers. However, mere duplication of parts has no patentable significance unless new and unexpected result is produced, see *In re Harza*, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960).

Flake et al does not explicitly disclose associating in the traveler database a subset of the plurality of travelers with a travel arranger;

displaying a user interface providing the subset of the plurality of travelers associated with the travel arranger;

receiving through the user interface a selection of a traveler from the subset of the plurality of travelers associated with the travel arranger; and

retrieving traveler data for the selected traveler from the traveler database.

However, Gardener et al discloses a customer profile database that stores every booking [0082]. Gardener et al further discloses allowing a travel planner to retrieve a travel profile for a second or subsequent traveler (i.e. a traveler associated with a travel planner) [0085, Examiner interprets a subset to include a "subsequent traveler"]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the travel reservation system of Flake et al the ability to associate, display, and select a subset of travelers associated with a travel arranger as taught by Gardener since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per **claims 2, and 26**, Flake et al further discloses further comprising:
deferring a task related to the travel request; routing the task to a travel counselor for completion (col 8, lines 1-17).

As per **claims 3 and 27**, Flake et al further discloses wherein routing the task includes determining the travel counselor to receive the task based on the type of task (col 8, lines 40-43).

As per **claims 6, 19, and 30**, Flake et al further discloses wherein the at least one travel service includes an airline reservation service (col 3, lines 26-29).

As per **claims 7, 20, and 31**, Flake et al further discloses wherein the at least one travel service includes a hotel reservation service (col 3, lines 26-29).

As per **claims 8, 21, and 32**, Flake et al further discloses wherein the at least one travel service includes a rental car reservation service (col 3, lines 26-29).

As per **claims 9, 22, and 33**, Flake et al further discloses wherein the at least one travel service includes a train reservation service (col 26-29).

As per **claims 10, 23, and 34**, Flake et al further discloses wherein the at least one travel service includes a limousine reservation service (col 26-29).

As per **claims 13 and 37**, Flake et al further discloses further comprising:
retrieving corporate travel data, said data including at least one travel policy;
determining a valid travel service option from the information from the GDS in accordance with the at least one travel policy (col 3, lines 55-65).

As per **claim 15**, Flake et al further discloses wherein the at least one GDS includes the Sabre system (col 3, lines 22-25).

As per **claim 18**, Flake et al further discloses wherein the at least one GDS includes the Worldspan system (col 3, lines 26-29).

As per **claim 24**, Flake et al further discloses further comprising a call management system operative to forward requests to a user of the travel services component (col 8, lines 4-16).

As per **claims 5 and 29**, Flake et al further discloses wherein routing the task includes determining a skill grouping for the task (col 1, lines 65-67; col 2, lines 1-6).

8. **Claims 4 and 28** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flake et al [U.S. Patent No. 5,832,451] in view of Gardener et al [US 2002/0178034] as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bull et al [U.S. Patent No. 5,995,943].

As per **claims 4 and 28**, Flake et al and Gardener et al disclose all the limitations of claims 1 and 2. Flake et al and Gardener et al do not disclose wherein routing the task includes determining that a travel related service has become available. However, Bull et al discloses a method for finding a requested service that was not yet available and monitoring information additions so that the user may be provided the information when it is available (col 6, lines 5-15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the travel reservation system of Flake et al, modified with Gardener et al, the ability to determine that a travel related service has become available as taught by Bull et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the

same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

9. **Claims 11 and 36** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flake et al [U.S. Patent No. 5,832,451] in view of Gardener et al [US 2002/0178034] as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Iyengar et al [U.S. Patent No. 6,360,205].

As per **claims 11 and 35**, Flake et al and Gardener et al disclose all the limitations of claim 1. Flake et al and Gardener et al do not disclose wherein retrieving traveler data from the traveler database includes retrieving data regarding a previous itinerary and further comprising copying the data regarding the previous itinerary into a current itinerary. However, Iyengar et al discloses accessing a database record for a traveler from a previous transaction to copy that data into a current request (col 8, lines 9-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Flake et al, modified with Gardener et al, to include the method disclosed by Iyengar et al. Iyengar et al provides the motivation that the information from the previous transaction so that the request can be pre-populated with information and the user can avoid typing the information again (col 8, lines 9-30).

10. **Claims 12 and 36** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flake et al [U.S. Patent No. 5,832,451] in view of Gardener et al [US

2002/0178034] as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Harris et al [US 2002/0108109].

As per **claims 12 and 36**, Flake et al and Gardener et al do not explicitly disclose wherein retrieving traveler data from the traveler database includes retrieving data regarding a first traveler's itinerary and further comprising copying the data regarding the first traveler's itinerary into a second traveler's itinerary. However, Harris et al discloses that a user inputs travel data for multiple passengers to generate a profile and that possible itineraries are presented based on the user's profile [0048]. Thus, suggesting that the first traveler's itinerary and the second traveler's itinerary include the same information as retrieved from the first itinerary. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the travel reservation system of Flake et al, modified with Gardener et al, the ability to copy the data regarding the first traveler's itinerary into a second traveler's itinerary as taught by Harris et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

11. **Claims 16 and 17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flake et al [U.S. Patent No. 5,832,451] in view of Gardener et al [US 2002/0178034] as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Lynch et al [U.S. Patent No.

6,119,094].

As per **claims 16 and 17**, Flake et al and Gardener et al disclose all the limitations of claim 14. Flake et al and Gardener et al do not disclose wherein the at least one GDS includes the Galileo system and the Amadeus system. However, Lynch et al discloses a travel reservation system that includes the Galileo system and the Amadeus system (col 4, lines 54-60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the travel reservation system of Flake et al, modified with Gardener et al, a GDS that includes the Galileo system and the Amadeus system as taught by Lynch et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Conclusion

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHANNON S. SALIARD whose telephone number is (571)272-5587. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Hayes can be reached on 571-272-6708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Please address mail to be delivered by the United States Postal Service (USPS) as follows:

***Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231***

Or faxed to:

(571) 273-5587 [Informal/ Draft Communications, labeled
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the Customer Service Window,
Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314

Shannon S Saliard
Examiner
Art Unit 3628

/S. S. S./
Examiner, Art Unit 3628

/John W Hayes/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3628